

## 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 05:27:32 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Defense

### 2. Fiscal Year

2018

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

400

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

06/06/2018

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

06/06/2020

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

### 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

### 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

### 11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

### 12. Specific Establishment Authority

Agency Determination

### 13. Effective Date

09/12/1984

### 14. Committee Type

Continuing

### 14c. Presidential?

No

### 15. Description of Committee

Scientific Technical Program Advisory Board

### 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

### 17a. Open 2 Meetings and Dates 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 2

Purpose	Start	End
Deliberative public meeting to discuss progress on EAB work tasks, focusing on Regional Strategic Assessments and Sustainability Training. Also gathered information and had preliminary discussions on the topics of regional sediment management and beneficial use and quantifying environmental benefits. The EAB will advise the Chief of Engineers on environmental policy, identification and resolution of environmental issues and missions, and addressing challenges, problems, and opportunities in an environmentally responsible manner. The EAB is interested in written and verbal comments from the public relevant to these purposes.	01/10/2018	01/10/2018
	09/21/2018	09/21/2018

### Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$150,000.00	\$190,000.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$26,000.00	\$60,000.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00

<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$16,000.00	\$20,000.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$6,000.00	\$20,000.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$198,000.00	\$290,000.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	1.50	1.50

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

The Board presents its advice and suggestions related to current environmental issues to the Chief of Engineers during Board meetings that are open to the public, and recommendations in the minutes of the Board meetings, and brief letter reports. Minutes of the Board meetings letter reports are available to the public on the Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board website.

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

Membership is formulated to contain a broad mix of environmental disciplines as well as a wide range of geographic representation and institutional backgrounds including academia, non-governmental organizations and non-Federal governments.

**20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?**

Meetings of the EAB are typically held twice each year. Meetings are open to the public. The board presents its advice and suggestions related to current environmental issues to the Chief of Engineers during Board meetings. Meetings allow the Chief to seek clarification of advice and suggestions and to request the Board to explore issues of concern to the Corps. At the January 2018 meeting, the board discussed and provided preliminary recommendations related to Sustainability training of USACE staff, and about improvements USACE could make to regional strategic assessments. These are just two of many tasks the Board is working on per direction of the Chief in the July 2017 meeting. Both of these are related to actions in the USACE Campaign Plan. The Board also began gathering information on regional sediment management, and beneficial use of dredged material, a topic of high relevance to USACE given recent legislation establishing a beneficial use pilot program and issues facing our navigation program. At the July 2017 meeting the, new Chief of Engineers provided guidance to the Board on which of these tasks he found most relevant to the Corps and that he wants them to pursue over the next two years. During FY16, the Board focused on finalizing recommendations described in their 2014-2015 Work Plan (available on the website) prior to the departure of LTG Bostick. They followed up on their recommendations on environmental flows (i.e., how to operate our projects to provide environmental benefits at little or no additional cost), on increasing recruitment and competencies in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields. They also produced two new reports- one on Ecosystem Goods and

Services and another on prioritizing ecosystem restoration projects. During FY15, the Board focused on items in their 2014-2015 work plan and produced the reports on e-flows and STEM. Topics generally consist of on-going or anticipated environmental challenges which face the Corps including activities of the Corps following record droughts and flooding, and the Corps' role regarding sustainable rivers, cumulative effects to large ecosystems, aging infrastructure, and invasive nuisance species. The Chief obtains expert independent, external advice from the Board; the Board serves as a vehicle of communication to facilitate collaboration and greater mutual understanding with the environmental community, and public at large.

**20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?**

The Secretary of Defense has determined that no other DoD advisory committee can provide the independent advice provided by the Chiefs of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board provides the Chief of Engineers (Department of the Army).

**20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?**

Meetings are not closed to the public unless the DoD determines that items on the planned agenda meet the closed meeting provisions of 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c). Pursuant to DoD policy closed meetings can only be authorized by the DoD Sponsor, the Secretary of the Army, and only after consultation with the Office of General Counsel for the Department of the Army.

**21. Remarks**

The Board does not always issue a separate report to the government Decision Maker. The Board's recommendations are often contained solely within its meeting minutes and occasional letters to the Chief of Engineers. The Board is not authorized to have subcommittees. The Board's charter says the estimated number of meetings is two per year, but is not required to hold two meetings. The Board held one deliberative meeting in FY18 on January 10th in Jacksonville, FL. At this meeting, the Board discussed in depth two of the tasks given to them in their July 2017 meeting and provided preliminary recommendations to the Chief of Engineers. A second meeting is scheduled for Sept 2018 where those recommendations will be finalized, and other topics will be discussed. The Board held one deliberative meeting in FY2017 on July 12, 2017 in Traverse City, MI. In 2017, the EAB focused on gathering information to develop a list of potential work topics to discuss with the new Chief of Engineers at their July meeting. They then focused on creating scopes of work for each task he requested. This was a more efficient and effective use of their time than holding a second public meeting in 2017. In FY2016, the board held meetings on Dec 2, 2015, in West Palm Beach, FL, and on June 23 in

Washington, DC. There is one remaining vacancy on the Board. The Board held only one deliberative meeting in both FY15 and in FY14 due to changeover in the majority of the Board members.

## Designated Federal Officer

Mindy M. Simmons DFO

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Atkinson, Samuel	06/24/2013	06/23/2019	Director of the Institute of Applied Science and Regents Professor in the Department of Biological Sciences, University of North Texas	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Barber, Mary	01/23/2014	01/22/2020	Senior Environmental Research Scientist, RTI International	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Daniels, Melinda	01/23/2014	01/22/2020	Associate Research Scientist, Stroud Water Research Center	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hotchkiss, Rollin	06/24/2013	06/23/2019	professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Ira A. Fulton College of Engineering and Technology Leadership chair, Brigham Young University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Newcomb, Tammy	01/23/2014	01/22/2020	Research Program Manager, Michigan Dept of Natural Resources - Fisheries Division	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Olander, Lydia	06/23/2015	06/22/2018	Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions, Duke University, NC, Director of Ecosystem Services Program	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Simenstad, Charles (Si)	01/23/2014	01/22/2020	Research Professor, University of Washington	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Sklar, Fred	06/23/2015	06/22/2018	South Florida Water Management District, Director, Everglades Ecosystems Assessment Section	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Somerville, Charles	06/23/2015	06/22/2018	Marshall University, WV, Dean, College of Science	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 9**

## Narrative Description

The Environmental Advisory Board supports and advances programs of the Army Corps of Engineers by supporting the Army and the Corps Strategic Plan and the Campaign Plans

**What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety

☐

Trust in government

☒

Major policy changes

☐

Advance in scientific research

☒

Effective grant making	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Outcome Comments

NA

### What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Cost Savings Comments

NA

### What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

32

### Number of Recommendations Comments

Committee has made recommendations on various aspects of ecosystem protection and restoration through Water Resources Management. Number above reflects total formal recommendations from 2003 through FY2017. Preliminary recommendations have been made on two topics in FY18 and will be provided formally at the September 2018 meeting. No data are available prior to 2003.

### What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

22%

### **% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments**

Percentage decreased due to many new recommendations in FY16 that we are working to respond to and implement. Recommendations are complex, multi-faceted scientific and technical in nature. All aspects are fully considered and individual components are implemented as appropriate over time.

### **What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?**

69%

### **% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments**

Recommendations are complex, multi-faceted scientific and technical in nature. All aspects are fully considered and individual components are implemented as appropriate over time. Suggested changes regarding revisions to Climate change guidance and cumulative effect analyses were partial adopted. Additional recommendations still being considered.

### **Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?**

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

### **Agency Feedback Comments**

Responses to committee recommendations are a part of discussions at subsequent meetings. Written feedback is also provided for some recommendations. Agency has also responded to recommendations through immediate implementation of obvious actions without formal correspondence back to the Board.

### **What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?**

	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **Action Comments**

In FY17 USACE incorporated the recommendation for a nationwide permit for low-head

dam removal into it's latest rounds of permits. USACE also implemented several of the Board's recommendations related to improving processes for prioritizing ecosystem restoration projects. In FY16, the EAB recommended that the Corps issue a nationwide permit for low-head dam removal to streamline authorization for removal of deteriorating or unused low-head dams for stream restoration. The EAB also made three recommendations on how the Corps can incorporate Ecosystem Goods and Services into its processes to inform its decisions and better illustrate outcomes. The EAB also provided six recommendations to change the process for prioritizing its ecosystem restoration projects. The Corps has already implemented two of these recommendations in its FY18 budget development process. In FY15, the EAB recommended that the Chief of Engineers develop a working group to address two issues related to recruitment of expertise in Science Technology Engineering and Math in the Corps of Engineers; focusing on first gathering data to better understand potential STEM resources to assist service members (particularly minorities); and second to recommend how to use these resources to make informed decisions about pursuing STEM education and careers within the Corps. During FY14 EAB suggested high priority aquatic ecosystem restoration projects including modifications of releases from reservoirs. The Corps has also implemented the EAB suggestion to incorporate an environmental awareness segment in the training course for all new district and division commanders. The EAB continues to develop recommendation on changes to facility operations to improve stream ecosystems and regarding water/energy conservation.

**Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?**

No

**Grant Review Comments**

NA

**How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?**

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Access Comments**

N/A